

## Chapter 5

---

### Consultation and Coordination



## 5.1 INTRODUCTION

Issues identified for analysis within this EA are included in **Appendix A**. This appendix includes the resource concerns identified, including those resources considered as Critical Elements of the Human Environment and related issues derived from the BLM, affiliated agency reviews and comments received.

Consultation and coordination among agencies and public parties with interests in the process was planned and conducted to ensure the opportunity for involvement throughout the plan amendment and EA process. Federal, state and local government agencies and Tribes that create, administer and monitor policy for these lands and adjacent lands were among the interested parties. BLM established a coordinated collaborative effort in developing the EA, by seeking the active participation from all of these parties.

## 5.2 PERSONS, GROUPS, AND AGENCIES CONSULTED

The BLM coordinated and collaborated with numerous federal, state, Tribal and local government agency representatives as well as private organizations and individuals wishing to participate in the LUP Amendment and FMP revision processes. The BLM contacted more than 60 federal representatives, 40 Utah state agency representatives, several in the neighboring states of Arizona, Nevada, and Colorado, officials of county and city governments across Utah and more than 70 Tribes and Tribal representatives. Each was provided with notices regarding public scoping meetings and planning bulletins informing them about the purpose, schedule and progress of the project. The mailing list, containing all agency points of contact, is contained in the Administrative Record within the project documentation. **Table 5.1** lists Persons, Agencies, and Organizations Consulted for Purposes of this EA.

**Table 5.1: List of Persons, Agencies, and Organizations Consulted for Purposes of this EA.**

Name	Purpose & Authorities for Consultation or Coordination	Findings & Conclusions
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Region 8	Consultation for responsibilities under NEPA and Section 309 of the Clean Water Act	The EPA provided formal comments to the BLM during public scoping on May 17, 2004 and identified concerns that included the need to develop broad fire planning to protect local ecology, recreation, and commodity production. The EPA requested that BLM consider management needs for local fuel hazards; that fire management planning would conform with Interim Air Quality policy and local smoke management plans; and that management be developed to protect aquatic resources from adverse impacts on soil and water. The EPA also identified analysis considerations associated with livestock grazing and noxious weed

Name	Purpose & Authorities for Consultation or Coordination	Findings & Conclusions
		control. The BLM considered EPA's comments and incorporated them into the Proposed Action and the analysis of the alternatives.
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service (FWS)	Consultation under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act (16 USC 1531) and Biological Assessment Review	FWS is a participating party who is consulting under an agreement that tiers off the BLM and FWS November 1, 2001 consultation agreement and March 3, 2004 alternative consultation agreement for land use planning. The service has provided comment and analysis recommendations for the species list prepared by the BLM. The service has also reviewed, provided additional Resource Protection Measures, and concurred with the species findings within the Biological Assessment, completed on March 4, 2005.
Tribes and Tribal Representatives within Utah and Surrounding States	Consultation as required by the American Indian Religious Freedom Act of 1978 (42 USC 1531) and NHPA (16 USC 1531)	Planning Bulletins were provided to approximately 50 tribes by BLM on June 21, 2004. In addition, individual letters were sent to each Tribal government on June 29, 2004 regarding BLM's intent to conduct this EA and request their participation and cooperation. Tribes were also invited to Public Scoping Meetings during July 6 to July 14, 2004. To date, formal Consultation is continuing.
Utah Governor's Office of Planning and Budget – Resource Development Coordinating Committee (RDCC)	Consultation on on-going multi-agency planning actions and associated federal planning actions	BLM and Maxim Technologies met with the RDCC on June 23, 2004 to discuss the scope of proposed fire management planning and to seek input from associated state agencies that may be affected by the proposed federal actions. The UDWR and FFSL indicated their desire to be involved in federal fire planning discussions (see proceeding comments). RDCC also responded to the BLM with a formal letter on July 15, 2004 that outlined the UDWR's considerations.

Name	Purpose & Authorities for Consultation or Coordination	Findings & Conclusions
Utah Department of Community and Economic Development - Utah State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO)	Consultation on proposed fire management as required by the NHPA (16 USC 470)	BLM and Maxim staff met with SHPO in June 2004 and July 2004 to discuss scope of planning and the possibility of SHPO acting as a participating party. SHPO had determined at these meetings not to act as a participating party, but they did provide feedback on the scope and analysis of the Proposed Action. In a meeting on January 25, 2005, BLM and SHPO agreed to develop a programmatic agreement specifically addressing wildland fire use on public lands within Utah. At this time, discussions on this agreement are still ongoing.
Utah Department of Natural Resources – Division of Forestry, Fire and State Lands (FFSL)	Consult on fire management planning on adjacent state lands	FFSL attended the BLM Statewide IDT meeting on June 22 - 23, 2004 and contributed to scope and analysis discussions. BLM met with FFSL on August 24, 2004 to discuss the proposed direction of statewide fire management on public lands, as well as the need to coordinate with local BLM field offices in the development of fire management planning at a local level as identified in the FMPs that tier off the statewide LUP Amendment. Maxim Technologies staff coordinated with FFSL staff in September and October 2004 to obtain resource data and historic wildland fire information to support BLM data and the development of the EAs.

Name	Purpose & Authorities for Consultation or Coordination	Findings & Conclusions
Utah Department of Natural Resources- Division of Wildlife Resources (UDWR)	Consult with UDWR as the agency with expertise on impacts on fish and wildlife species	The UDWR, in association with the Governor's Office and Planning and Budget, and RDCC, provided formal comments to the BLM on July 15, 2004 and a request to be included as a participating party. The BLM coordinated proposed fire management actions with UDWR and consideration of wildland fire use to benefit wildlife habitat. Maxim staff coordinated with a variety of UDWR personnel from July through October 2004 in developing fish and wildlife resource data, GIS data, and scope of analysis within the EAs. These meetings also included coordination with the UDWR Utah Natural Heritage Program.
Summit County Fire Chief (SCFC)	Informal discussion with the county fire chief about county lands issues	On July 14, 2004, SCFC discussed lands and realty issues with the BLM in regards to actions within the Salt Lake Field Office. The BLM provided the SCFS with explanation and maps associated with the Iso-Tract planning area and how lands are exchanged.
Uintah County Commission (UCC)	Informal discussion with county commissioner on resource issues in county	On July 13, 2004, the UCC Commissioner provided comments to the BLM in regards to protection of sage grouse habitat and limited restriction on livestock grazing of burned areas. Comments in regards to habitat were incorporated into the Proposed Action for the statewide amendment EA and Vernal FMP EA. The limited restriction on livestock allotment resting was considered during the development of the land use plan and FMP Proposed Actions.

Name	Purpose & Authorities for Consultation or Coordination	Findings & Conclusions
Wayne County Economic Development (WCED)	Consult on federal planning impacts on local government planning	On June 28, 2004, WCED provided comments to the BLM during public scoping regarding consideration of wildland urban interface coordination in Wayne County, as well as how federal planning may provide mutually benefits to each entity. Considerations of WCED's comments were incorporated into proposed fire management planning.

### 5.3 SUMMARY OF PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

#### 5.3.1 Notice of Intent

During preparation of the EA, the public was notified of the Proposed Action. A Notice of Intent (NOI) to initiate this planning effort was published in the Federal Register on April 2, 2004. The publication of this NOI initiated a public scoping comment period, inviting participation of affected and interested agencies, organizations and members of the general public to assist the BLM in determining the scope of issues to be addressed. Comments were received from April 2, 2004 through July 21, 2004.

#### 5.3.2 Public Involvement Plan

A Public Involvement Plan was prepared in June 2004 to manage and ensure an effective, consistent and open communication process among BLM and other federal agencies, state and local government agencies, Native American tribes, the public and other stakeholders. This Plan not only outlined the series of 'Open House' public meetings to be conducted throughout the state that would allow for comment and discussion on current and proposed fire management, but also planned for continued public involvement opportunities and actions from the start of the project through to completion.

#### 5.3.3 Planning Bulletin

A Planning Bulletin was also developed to advise the public and describe the fire management project; encourage public participation at the public scoping meetings; and identify opportunities and methods for submitting comments throughout the NEPA process. In addition to providing background information, the Bulletin outlined the public involvement process for the project; the schedule; a listing of public meetings; instructions on making comments and joining the mailing list; information about the project's public website; and contact information. On June 24, 2004, the Bulletin was sent to 1,149 individuals, organizations, state, county and city government agencies, Tribal governments and groups on the BLM's mailing list. The BLM sent each Tribal government an individualized letter (dated June 29, 2004) inviting them to consult on the project. Native American consultation is ongoing. All entities on the mailing list were contacted about the project and invited to submit comments. In addition, a website has been established that displays information about this project. It is located at <http://www.ut.blm.gov/fireplanning/index.htm>.

### 5.3.4 Public Meetings

From July 6 through July 14, 2004, BLM conducted five Open House meetings in Moab, Cedar City, Richfield, Vernal and Salt Lake City, Utah. The intent of the public meetings was to provide opportunities to federal, state and local agencies, interested organization and members of the general public to provide meaningful input to the planning process.

These meetings were announced in the Planning Bulletin. On June 25, 2004, a public notice was delivered as a media advisory and press release to newspapers, radio stations and one cable television station throughout Utah and to newspapers and radio stations in Arizona, Colorado and Nevada. The notice announced public scoping meeting dates, times and locations and invited the public to participate. Further, the Utah BLM webpage advertised the meetings and scoping period. Approximately 700 subscribers of the Utah BLM electronic newsletter ("E-Briefs") received related information.

A series of Public Scoping Meetings were held across the state according to the schedule in **Table 5.2**.

**Table 5.2 Public Scoping Meetings**

Date	City	Facility	Address
July 6, 2004	Moab	BLM Field Office	82 East Dogwood
July 7, 2004	Cedar City	Heritage Center, Festival Hall 1	90 North Main
July 8, 2004	Richfield	BLM Field Office	150 East 900 North
July 13, 2004	Vernal	Western Park	302 West 200 South
July 14, 2004	Salt Lake City	BLM Field Office	2370 South 2300 West

An open house format was used for the scoping meetings, in which attendees could interact informally and individually with BLM representatives at stations providing information on fire management planning, land use planning and local fire operations. Attendees signed a registration sheet and received an information packet with handouts including a comment form, state map depicting the five FMP planning areas, the NOI and a list of project-related web resources. Additional handouts and personnel were available at stations in the meeting room. One station provided a description of BLM land use planning and the LUP Amendment process and schedule; another provided details of Fire Management Planning actions statewide with FMP boundaries and a list of potential actions; and a third provided a description of local BLM Field Office Fire Management and Operations. An introductory video on fire management and fire tips related to the Wildland Urban Interface was also provided for viewing.

An area was provided for participants to write or ask questions for further clarification. Visual aids included maps of FMP planning areas, LUP areas, fire occurrence in each FMP planning area, project schedule and two flow charts showing the relationship of a LUP to an FMP and the fire management implementation process. Attendees were free to fill out a comment form at the comment table before leaving the meeting. Both written and verbal comments were recorded, analyzed and reported in the Scoping Report and considered in preparation of this EA. A total of 3 comments were solicited at these five meetings.

### 5.3.5 Public Comments

During the public scoping period, a total of 20 letters were received via mail or email, with 91 total comments recorded. Ten organizations, 3 individuals, and 3 agencies or governmental bodies submitted letters. Organizations providing comments were the Utah Farm Bureau Federation, Wild Utah Project, The Wilderness Society, Natural Resources Defense Council, Sportsmen for Fish and Wildlife, Canyon Country Youth Corps, Wildlife Management Institute, Red Rock Forests, Sierra Club- Utah Chapter, and the Southern Utah Wilderness Society. Government agencies or bodies providing comments were the Environmental Protection Agency, the Wayne County Economic Development agency, and the State of Utah Resource Development Coordinating Committee. Detailed discussions took place between the BLM, The Wilderness Society and other environmental groups to address substantial comments raised during the public scoping period.

A comment summary table was developed that grouped comments by topic and is a part of the Scoping Report which can be found in the Administrative Record for this project.

### 5.4 LIST OF PREPARERS

BLM selected an environmental consultant, Maxim Technologies, from a list of qualified environmental services contractors through a competitive procurement process to support Utah BLM on this important LUP Amendment EA. Therefore the preparers of this EA included a combination of BLM and contract personnel.

#### 5.4.1 BLM Preparers

BLM's Interdisciplinary Team assisted in the preparation of this EA and with development and evaluation of the proposed fire management direction and LUP Amendment as well as with portions of the EA document. BLM participants and their responsibilities are listed in **Table 5.2**. BLM also assigned a contracting officer's representative and technical project lead with primary responsibilities for oversight of contractors, agency collaboration and the NEPA process.

**Table 5.3 BLM Preparers**

Name	Title	Document Section Responsibility
Jolie Pollet	Project Manager	Technical coordination, vegetation, fire ecology, Proposed Action, Resource Protection Measures
Matthew Higdon	NEPA Planner	Technical coordination, planning, NEPA
Ron Bolander	TES Specialist	Section 7 consultation, review of wildlife, special status species
Lori Hunsaker	Cultural Resource Specialist	Cultural resources, Native American consultation
Lisa Bryant	Soils Scientist	Soils
Kathy Radigan	Forester	Forestry and woodlands
Brad Washa	Fuels Specialist	Fire Management
Steve Madsen	Wildlife Biologist	Wildlife
Tom Mendenhall	Fisheries Biologist	Fisheries
Larry Lichthardt	Range Specialist	Livestock grazing
David Mermejo	Wilderness Planner	Recreation, special designation, wilderness,



Name	Title	Document Section Responsibility
		visual
Jack Brown	ESR Specialist	ESR
Greg Zschaechner	Air Quality Specialist	Air quality
Keith Rigtrup	Planner	Socioeconomics, environmental justice
George Cruz	Hydrologist	Watersheds

#### 5.4.2 Maxim Technologies Preparers

Maxim assembled a team of managers and resource specialists (**Table 5.3**, below) who assisted the BLM Interdisciplinary Team to provide independent, objective NEPA compliance and support; conduct environmental assessment of potentially affected resources; and complete GIS data analysis and detailed maps.

**Table 5.4 Maxim Technologies Preparers**

Name	Title	Document Section Responsibility
Jim Melton	Project Manager	Planning, NEPA
David Steed	Asst. Project Manager	US Fish and Wildlife consultation, planning, NEPA
Mike Egan	Asst. Project Manager	Planning
Susan Hatch	Biologist	Special status species, fish and wildlife, collaboration
Terry Grotbo	Senior NEPA & Planning Advisor	NEPA review
Fred Gifford	GIS Coordinator	GIS, database
Valerie Waldorf	Lead GIS Specialist	GIS, maps, figures
Wynn John	Environmental Engineer	Air quality, visual, forestry
Stephanie Phippen	Hydrologist	Watershed
Craig Clement	Geologist	Water, soils, geology
Greg Dawdy	Biologist	Fisheries
Sarah DeRosear	Wildlife Biologist	Special status species
Bruce Glisson	Vegetation Specialist	Vegetation
David Kane	Senior Ecologist	Vegetation, grazing
Tennille Flint	Biologist	Soil and water
Jeff Bass	Fire Fuels Specialist	Fire and fuels management
Karen Lyncoln	Socioeconomics Specialist	Socioeconomics, environmental justice
Richard Leferink	Environmental Specialist	Socioeconomics, environmental justice
Dale-Marie Herring	Technical Writer/ Coordinator	Writing, editing
Michael Polk	Cultural/Paleontologist	Cultural, paleontology
Don Southworth	Archaeologist	Cultural
Angela Nelson	Environmental Specialist	Land use, special designations
Dick Mangan	Fire Specialist	Fire and fuels management